UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/593,049	09/15/2006	Seiya Osada	072982-0279	7269

22428   7590   11/16/2009

FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP
SUITE 500
3000 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER
KAZEMINEZHAD, FARZAD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *9/11 & 8/25/09*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   In response to the office action from 5/26/2009, the applicant has submitted an amendment, one filed on 8/25/2009, amending the independent claims 1, 8, and the dependent claims 15-21 and 32-36 followed by a second amendment on 9/11/2009 amending the independent claims 1, 8, and the dependent claims 13 and 15, adding the claims 37-39, while arguing to traverse the art rejection. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are moot with respect to new grounds of rejection further in view of Tanner et al. (US 2004/0153306).

2.   In response to the amendment of Fig. 9, the examiner has withdrawn the previous objection to the drawings.

3.   In response to amending the title, the examiner has withdrawn the previous objection to the specification.

Response to Arguments

4.   In what follows responses to each of the Remarks (i.e., of 8/25 versus 9/11) are provided with each case identified by its date.

        Pages 14-15 of the 8/25 Remarks basically outline the list of amended items and the first action references used. On page 16 the second ¶, the applicant contends that the primary reference used in the first action Kugimiya et al. (US Patent 5,161,105) fails

to teach the version of the claim which was amended on 8/25/2009. Since that

amendment was followed by a second amendment which basically undid the 8/25/2009

amendment of the said claim, and placed that claim in the same status as the original

submission, therefore those arguments are moot and the rejection according to the first

office action stands.

On the 4th ¶ on page 16 of the 8/25 Remarks the applicant has questioned the

rationale of using Hon et al. (US Patent 6,490,563) for the dependent claim 5; i.e., in

lines 8-7 above the bottom of the page the applicant contends: "Hon et al. does not

teach or suggest recognizing a sound synthesized and outputted and automatically

generating a notation to identify the proper noun", followed a few lines below where the

applicant concedes that: "The combination of Hon et al. and Kugimiya et al. would utilize

a proper noun providable to a speaker, but whereby there is no teaching or suggestion

to also provide a notation associated with the proper noun". Here the second statement

for the most part answers the point raised in the first by the applicant, but questions if

the proper noun generated is associated with a "notation" when presented to the

speaker.

The applicant is respectfully reminded that in using Kugimiya et al., the examiner

made every attempt to clarify to the applicant that the examiner had mapped the

applicant's "notation" to the references "acronym" wherever "notation" appeared in the

claim language. Here in particular at the last line of page 11 of the office action with

respect to claim 5, this was also specifically pointed out; i.e., Kugimiya et al. does

generate proper nouns and its proper noun generation involves determining if they are

associated with an acronym (Col. 2 lines 20-22). Therefore presenting a proper noun to a speaker will involve presenting it with its associated acronym (notation) if it is determined that such an acronym exists. These points therefore make the arguments in the last ¶ of page 16 and the first ¶ of page 17 of the 8/25/09 remarks moot.

Page 14 of corresponding the Remarks of the 9/11/2009 amendment basically outlines the list of amended items and the first action references used. Page 15 the first ¶ discusses the prior art primary reference Kugimiya et al. fails to teach features added as new claims. The applicant is respectfully directed at the office action below. The 4th ¶ questions teachings of column 1, lines 64-67 of Kugimiya et al. with respect to 2nd limitation of the first claim; i.e., the applicant contends: those lines "describe displaying a source language and a target language that has been translated, but this is different from displaying a proper noun and a notation as a pair !

The examiner respectfully asks: isn't "OPEC" a notation corresponding to the proper noun "Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries"? Fig. 15 also shows they are displayed in pair in both the target as well as the source languages. A further examination of the disclosure (e.g., ¶ 0027) also reveals the applicant has also defined "notation" as a "corresponding character string". So the examiner does not really comprehend what the applicant is arguing above and assesses the quoted statement above to be incorrect unless the applicant as mentioned above had not recognized the mapping of "notation" to Kugimiya et al. "acronym".

The applicant has not provided any discussion of the prior art rejection of any other of the dependent claims. Therefore their rejection is retained; but in the Office

Action below the examiner attempted to better clarify some of the points that appeared

unclear and confusing according to his remarks above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6.   Claims 1-2, 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Kugimiya et al. (US Patent 5,161,105).

Regarding claim 1, Kugimiya et al. does teach a machine translation system

mechanically translating a sentence inputted in a first language into a second language,

comprising:

a proper noun dictionary data identification notation generating section for

generating a notation to identify reading a proper noun described in the second

language (Col. 2 lines 28-34 teach a dictionary means with acronym (proper noun

notation) processing means for translating compound words with capital letters (proper

nouns as defined in Col. 2 lines 24-26 whose number of capital letters correspond to the

number of letters of the acronym) associated with the said acronyms in a target

language);

a pair display section for displaying a pair including the proper noun and the

notation (Col. 1 lines 64-67 teach display means for displaying the source and target

languages in the machine translation system and Fig. 15 demonstrates the output and

the input of to include the proper noun and its notation (acronym));

and a machine translation section for translating by converting, when the notation

is included in the inputted sentence, the notation to the proper noun (Col. 1 lines 56-60

teach a machine translation apparatus capable of processing proper nouns (in the

source language) with an acronym (notation); Col. 2 lines 8-13 teach machine

translation system employing converting means utilizing a dictionary for converting a

source (input) sentence into a target (translated) sentence; Col. 2 lines 18-21 teach

determining means employed to determine if a word or group of words in the source

language are a proper noun with an acronym; finally Col. 2 lines 29-33 teach acronym

(notation in the source language) processing means for translating compound words

(proper nouns in the source language) associated with the acronym into a sentence in

the target language (a proper noun in the target language) when the compound words

are registered in the dictionary as proper nouns associated with the acronym in the

source language (Fig. 15 depicts an example of such a translation involving an

acronym); Abstract also teaches a machine translation system capable of examining

whether or not a word string corresponds to a proper noun associated with an acronym

(notation) and a device for determining whether or not these words are registered in

their dictionary before doing their translation).

Regarding claim 2, Kugimiya et al. does teach a machine translation system in accordance with claim1, comprising: a user dictionary (Col. 1 lines 62-65 and Col. 3 lines 49-51 teach dictionary means depicted in Fig. 1 module 6);

and a proper noun user dictionary storage section for storing and keeping in the user dictionary as a pair of parallel translation, the proper noun and the notation to identify the proper noun generated at the proper noun identification notation generating section (Col. 6 lines 10-15 teach examining whether an acronym and its associated compound words whose capital letters correspond to the number of letters of the acronym are registered in the dictionary; this implies that the dictionary module 6 in Fig. 1 to also store proper nouns and their respective acronyms (notations) which can translate both the acronym and its corresponding compound words (i.e. performs a pair of parallel translations));

wherein the machine translation section translates the inputted sentence by using the user dictionary(Col. 3 lines 46-52 teach the translation module 5 in Fig. 1 translates an entered source language into a target language utilizing the dictionary module stored in the memory unit 6).

Regarding claims 8, 9 they correspond to the methods corresponding to the apparatus of the claims 1,2 respectively and are rejected using similar rationale. Note that Kugimiya et al. does teach both apparatus as well as their respective methods.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kugimiya et al.

Regarding claims 15, 16, they comprise the method limitations of the method

claims 8, 9 respectively on a computer and are therefore rejected by the same rationale.

Figs. 10A, 10B, 11A and 11B depict computer program flow charts of the embodiments

of the invention.

Kugimiya et al. though does not specifically disclose <u>a computer readable</u>

<u>medium embodying a</u> computer program corresponding to the said flow charts.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made that storing these programs on a computer readable medium would

enable mass distribution and help in commercial success of the product.

9.   Claim 3, 10, 17, 22, 27, 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Kugimiya et al., and further in view of Palmquist (US Patent

7,359,849).

Regarding claim 3, Kugimiya et al. does not specifically disclose a machine translation system in accordance with claim 1, wherein:

the proper noun identification notation generating section reads a proper noun from map information including proper nouns and automatically generates notation to identify the proper noun; and

the display section outputs a map in which the notation corresponding character string is disposed in the vicinity of the proper noun included in the map.

Palmquist does teach a proper noun identification notation generating section reads a proper noun from map information including proper nouns and automatically generates notation to identify the proper noun (Col. 2 lines 10-12 teach a text translation tool capable of translating a source document which includes a graphic element (e.g. a map); Col. 4 lines 32-36 teach an acronym expander (notation generator) unit 44 in Fig. 2 which can identify potential acronyms in the source language and provide their translations as acronyms in the target language; Col. 3 lines 18-22 teach an example of reading proper nouns included in a map (i.e., the proper nouns United States (26A) and AIDS (24A) next to a map of the US (28A) as shown in Fig. 1 slide 14A); Col. 3 lines 48-55 teach translation (automatic generation) of the corresponding proper nouns (26B and 24B in the slide 14B in Fig. 1) in the target language next to the map) ;

and the pair display section outputs a map in which the notation is disposed in the vicinity of the proper noun included in the map (Col. 3 lines 62-65 teach the source and target language corresponding slides 14A and 14B displayed side-by-side

(displayed in pair) such that in the target slide also the acronyms (i.e., notations corresponding to the proper nouns AIDS and United States in slide 14A)in one picture are shown in the target language next to the same map in the other slide 14B in Fig. 2 resulting in having the proper noun 'AIDS' appear in pair with its target language corresponding notation or acronym ('SIDA')).

It would have therefore been obvious to someone with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that utilizing the specialized translation tools 66, 68 and 70 of Fig. 3 of Palmquist into the translation module of Kugimiya et al. (unit 5 in Fig. 1) will enable Kugiyama et al. to also expand its ability to read in graphic elements (such as maps) in its translations and thereby increase its commercial potentials.

Regarding claims 10, 27 they correspond to the methods corresponding to the apparatus of the claim 3, 22 respectively and are rejected using similar rationale. Note that both Kugimiya et al. as well as Palmquist do teach apparatus as well as their respective methods.

Regarding claims 17, 32 they comprise the method limitations of the method claims 10, 27 on a computer and are therefore rejected by the same rationale. Kugimiya et al. Figs. 10A, 10B, 11A and 11B depict computer program flow charts and Palmquist Col. 2 lines 32-35 teach of the embodiments of the invention on a computer readable medium comprising program instructions.

Regarding claim 22, it comprises of nearly identical limitations as claim 3 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

10.   Claim 4, 11, 18, 23, 28, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kugimiya et al., and further in view of Sugishima (US Patent 5,727,082).

Regarding claim 4, Kugimiya et al. does teach a machine translation system in accordance with claim 1, further comprising:

the proper noun identification notation generating section automatically generates a notation corresponding to the proper noun character string that has been recognized (Col. 2 lines 18-21 teach determining means employed to determine if a word or group of words in the source language are a proper noun with an acronym (i.e., the character string corresponding to the acronym is recognized to be an acronym first in the source language); Col. 2 lines 28-34 teach a dictionary means with acronym (proper noun notation) processing means for translating (automatically generating) compound words with capital letters (proper nouns as defined in Col. 2 lines 24-26 whose number of capital letters correspond to the number of letters of the acronym) associated with the said acronyms in a target language and therefore inherently can recognize an acronym (a proper noun character string) in the target language as well; so acronyms (proper noun notations) can be identified in both the source as well as the target languages);

Kugimiya et al. does not teach an imaging section for producing an image;

and a character recognizing section for recognizing a proper noun character string in image data obtained by the imaging section.

Sugishima does teach an imaging section for producing an image (the scanner as disclosed in Col. 1 lines 26-29 and depicted in Fig. 1 as the units 104 and 105);

and a character recognizing section for recognizing a proper noun character string in image data obtained by the imaging section (Abstract lines 7-6 from the bottom and Col. 1 lines 27-29 teach characters of scanned images are recognized; Col. 6 lines 43-49 teach once characters recognized they are stored in the storage unit 110 in Fig. 1).

It would have therefore been obvious to someone with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that utilizing the scanner units 104 and 105 of Sugishima et al. into the translation apparatus of Kugimiya et al. by importing the units 104 and 105 next to the keyboard unit 4 in Fig. 1 of Kugimiya et al. would enable Kugimiuya et al. to possess another means of input (scanning) in addition to utilizing the keyboard and thereby make Kugimiya et al.'s system more user friendly.

Regarding claims 11, 28, they correspond to the methods corresponding to the apparatus of the claims 4, 23 respectively and are rejected using similar rationale. Note that both Kugimiya et al. as well as Sugishima do teach apparatus as well as their respective methods.

Regarding claims 18, 33 they comprise the method limitations of the method

claims 11,28 on a computer and is therefore rejected by the same rationale. Kugimiya et

al. Figs. 10A, 10B, 11A and 11B depict computer program flow charts and Sugishima

Col. 8 lines 39-41 teach of the embodiments of the invention implemented as software

(computer readable) on a computer (medium).

Regarding claim 23, it comprises of nearly identical limitations as claim 4, and is

therefore rejected under similar rationale.

11.   Claims 5, 7, 12, 14, 19, 24, 26, 29, 31, 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Kugimiya et al., and further in view of Hon et al. (US Patent

6,490,563).

Regarding claim 5, Kugimiya et al. does teach a machine translation system in

accordance with claim 1, comprising:

the proper noun identification notation generating section comprising a proper

noun storage section storing proper nouns described in the second language (Col. 6

lines 10-15 teach examining whether an acronym and its associated compound words

whose capital letters correspond to the number of letters of the acronym are registered

in the dictionary; this implies that the dictionary module 6 in Fig. 1 to also store proper

nouns and their respective acronyms (notations) which can translate both the acronym

and its corresponding compound words and therefore includes both the source as well as the target (second)language proper nouns);

Kugimiya et al. does not teach an audio synthesizing section for reading out a proper noun from the proper noun storage section storing proper nouns described in the second language and synthesizing and outputting a sound corresponding to the proper noun;

and an audio recognizing section for recognizing the sound synthesized and outputted as above and automatically generating a notation to identify the proper noun.

Hon et al. does teach in one embodiment a text to speech converter capable of reading text comprised of phonetic symbols corresponding to several foreign languages and outputs the text to an output audio signal in the respective languages (Col. 3 lines 3-9, Col. 6 lines 5-8 and unit 121 in Fig. 5), and in another embodiment it teaches a speech recognition module receiving input speech and converting it to text in the speech language (Col. 7 lines 11-17 and Fig. 6).

It would have therefore been obvious to someone with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that utilizing units 5 and 6 of Honet al. by attaching them in series to the unit 14 in Fig. 3 of Kugimiya et al. would enable the latter to firstly utilizing unit 5 to synthesize the target language text corresponding to a translation including its proper nouns and its respective acronyms (notations) into speech in the respective foreign language and secondly utilizing unit 6 for converting those speech the respective language and thereby enable proof reading of the message translation process by first hearing it as speech and help in quality control of the translations.

Regarding claim 7, Kugimiya et al. does not specifically disclose a server device, comprising,

in place of the machine translation section of the machine translation system in accordance with claim 1, an automatic interpretation section for converting and outputting the notation, when the notation is included in a sound inputted thereto into the sound of the proper noun corresponding to the notation in the second language.

Hon et al. does teach in one embodiment a text to speech converter capable of reading text comprised of phonetic symbols corresponding to several foreign languages and outputs the text to an output audio signal in the respective languages (Col. 3 lines 3-9, Col. 6 lines 5-8 and unit 121 in Fig. 5), and in another embodiment it teaches a speech recognition module receiving input speech and converting it to text in the speech language (Col. 7 lines 11-17 and unit 160 in Fig. 6).

It would have therefore been obvious to someone with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that utilizing units 5 and 6 of Hon et al. by attaching Hon et al.'s speech recognition module (unit 160 in Fig. 6) to the unit 11 of Kugimiya et al. and the text to speech module of Hon et al. (unit 121 in Fig. 5) to the unit 14 of Kugimiya et al. would enable the latter to firstly utilizing unit 6 and converting the source speech including the acronyms (notations of proper nouns) to text which will undergo translation by the translation engine and to later synthesize the target language text corresponding to a translation including its proper nouns and its respective acronyms (notations) into speech in the respective translated target foreign (second) language and thereby enable proof reading of the message translation process by first hearing it

as speech and help in quality control of the translations.

Regarding claims 12, 14, 29, 31 they correspond to the methods corresponding

to the apparatus of the claims 5, 7, 24, 26 respectively and are rejected using similar

rationale. Note that both Kugimiya et al. as well as Hon et al. do teach apparatus as well

as their respective methods.

Regarding claims 19, 21,34, 36 they comprise the method limitations of the

method claims 12, 14, 29, 31 respectively on a computer and are therefore rejected by

the same rationale. Kugimiya et al. Figs. 10A, 10B, 11A and 11B depict computer

program flow charts and Hon et al. in the Abstract does teach a computer implemented

(readable medium) system and method.

Regarding claim 24, 26, they comprise of nearly identical limitations as claims 5,

7 respectively and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

12.   Claims 6, 13, 20, 25, 30, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Kugimiya et al. and further in view of Muranaga (US Patent

6,944,464).

Regarding claim 6, Kugimiya et al. does not teach a server device for supplying

proper noun information to the machine translation system in accordance with claim 1,

comprising:

a regional proper noun information storage section for storing therein, according to regions, proper nouns described in arbitrary one language; and

a proper noun information selecting and transmitting section for receiving positional information from the machine translation system and selectively transmitting proper noun information according to the positional information.

Muranaga does teach an access server (unit 41 in Fig. 1) which can access public networks 21 and 31which possess regional information (e.g. information including names or proper nouns about local or regional police (unit 33 Fig. 1), local financial institutions (unit 35 Fig. 1), local medical institutions (unit 34 Fig. 1) (Col. 6 lines 34-43); it also teaches a mobile terminal (unit 10 in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2) which is equipped with a Global Positioning System (unit 16 in Fig. 2) allowing the mobile terminal to broadcast its positional information to the server 41, the server 41 accessing local public networks 21 and 31 retrieves for example an emergency or hospital institution information (including its name or proper noun) close to the positional information of the mobile terminal and translates it to the local language and sends it to the hospital (Col. 3 lines 19-35).

It would have therefore been obvious to someone with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that utilizing the mobile terminal unit 10 in Fig. 2 into the message translation apparatus of Kugimiya et al. by attaching it to the speech synthesizer unit of the Kugimiya et al. in view of Hon et al. (i.e. unit 121 in Fig. 5 of Hon et al. when connected to the unit 14 of Kugimiya et al.) would enable it to retrieve

important emergency, bank or police information from the access server via the local

servers if the machine translation system is utilized in a foreign country and thereby

utilize it as a useful tool for translation and other choirs encountered when visiting a

foreign country.

Regarding claim 13, 30 they correspond to the methods corresponding to the

apparatus of the claims 6, 25 respectively and are rejected using similar rationale. Note

that Kugimiya et al., Muranaga as well as Hon et al. all do teach apparatus as well as

their respective methods.

Regarding claim 20, 35 they comprise the method limitations of the method

claims 13, 30 on a computer and are therefore rejected by the same rationale. Kugimiya

et al. Figs. 10A, 10B, 11A and 11B depict computer program flow charts and Muranaga

in Col. 2 last line does teach a computer program product (readable medium).

Regarding claim 25, it comprises of nearly identical limitations as claim 6, and is

therefore rejected under similar rationale.

13.   Claims 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kugimiya et al. (US Patent 5,161,105), and further in view of Tanner et al. (US

2004/0153306).

Regarding claim 37, Kugimiya et al. does teach a machine translation system in accordance with claim 1.

Kugimiya et al. does not teach his apparatus and method wherein the notation is generated as a phonetic equivalent of the proper noun in the first language.

Tanner et al. does teach a proper noun recognition system and method, wherein the notation is generated as a phonetic equivalent of the proper noun in the first language (Abstract teaches proper nouns are augmented by their pronunciation in a natural language (first language) with at least one native pronunciation in another language (second language); furthermore, page 5, the 1st column, lines 17-12 above the bottom teach this augmenting includes converting one phonetic representation of the pronunciation in the first language into a second phonetic representation (i.e. a phonetic equivalent notation) in the second language prior to being stored in the dictionary (i.e. module 16 in Fig. 1);

It would have therefore been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that incorporating the functions of the dictionary module 16 in Fig. 1 of Tanner et al. into the dictionary module 6 in Fig. 1 of Kugimiya et al. would enable the latter to represent phonetic equivalent notations corresponding to the proper nouns in the second or translated language enabling their representation with the correct pronunciation to maximize their recognition.

Regarding claim 38, it corresponds to the methods corresponding to the system represented in claim 37 and it is therefore rejected under similar rationale. Note that

both Kugimiya et al. and Tanner et al. teach systems as well as their respective
methods.

Regarding claim 39 it comprises the method limitations of the method claims
37on a computer and are therefore rejected by the same rationale. Kugimiya et al. Figs.
10A, 10B, 11A and 11B depict computer program flow charts and Tanner et al. on page
6 the first column lines 17-15 above the bottom teach a computer readable medium
utilized in storing embodiments of his invention.

Conclusion

14.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to
applicant's disclosure. Lu et al. (US Patent 5,410,475).

15.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in
this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP
§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37
CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE
MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within
TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not
mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the
shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

16.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to FARZAD KAZEMINEZHAD whose telephone number is

(571)270-5860. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30AM-5:00 PM EST.

       If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Talivaldis I. Smits can be reached on (571)272-7628. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

17.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/FK/

/Talivaldis Ivars Smits/   11/12/2009
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2626